

## **REMARKS**

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 7, and 13. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 remain currently pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,185,860 to Wu ("Wu").<sup>1</sup>

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wu. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a combination including, for example, "a node information providing unit configured to provide the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information compared by the comparing unit to the another node, but without the interface identification information, only when it is judged that the converted interface identification information from the function conversion unit coincides

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

with the converted interface identification information from the another node at the comparing unit.”<sup>2</sup> Wu fails to disclose at least these features of amended claim 1.

Wu discloses “a flow chart of the process of adding a node to the node list” by an application module “addnode block 410” in “computer system 100.” See Wu, column 9, lines 4-5, Figs. 5 & 15. In Fig. 15, “after entry, block 1502 performs a hash operation on the IP address to create a pointer into the node list. Block 1504 then allocates memory for a node record, and block 1506 stores the data available for the node into the node record at the location pointed to by the hashed IP address.” Wu, column 9, lines 5-11, emphasis added.

Therefore, Wu merely discloses that addnode block 410 converts the IP address of another node in order to obtain an address on a memory space in computer system 100 in which the data of the another node is to be stored. Wu fails to disclose “the interface identification information converted by using the one way function which is received from another node,” or “to compare . . . with interface identification information as converted by the function conversion unit,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action alleges that “[t]he comparing part of the applicants claim furthermore reads on (Column 6-7 Lines 67-5, ‘That is, when the process-ping module queries the node, it determines the state of the node at the present time. This state is compared, in block 806, with the state of the node as it was known previously in the database. If that state has changed, block 806 transfers to block 808 to store the new state in the database’).” (Office Action at 14.) Applicants respectfully disagree.

---

<sup>2</sup> Support for the amendments may be found at, for example, pages 11 and 12 of the specification.

In the portions cited by the Examiner, Wu explicitly states that “when FIG. 8 is called, the address of a single node is passed to it.” Wu, column 6, lines 56-57.

Therefore, Wu’s teaching of comparing state information of a remote node based on the address cannot constitute “the interface identification information converted by using the one way function which is received from another node,” or “to compare . . . with interface identification information as converted by the function conversion unit,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Wu also discloses that “FIG. 10 shows a flowchart of the process-IFIP module block 310 (FIG. 3). The IF and IP tables are available in a node to define the translation of physical addresses to IP addresses.” Wu, column 7, lines 40-44. However, Wu’s teaching of translation between physical addresses to IP addresses is contrary to “a node information providing unit configured to provide the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information compared by the comparing unit to the another node, but without the interface identification information,” as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

In fact, Wu is completely silent on “a node information providing unit configured to provide the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information compared by the comparing unit to the another node, but without the interface identification information, only when it is judged that the converted interface identification information from the function conversion unit coincides with the converted interface identification information from the another node at the comparing unit,” as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

Therefore, Wu fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 1. Wu thus cannot anticipate amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 102(b) rejection of amended claim 1. Because claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1, Applicants also request withdrawal of the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 2 and 4-6 for at least the same reasons stated above.

Further, amended independent claims 7 and 13, while of different scope, include similar recitations to those of amended claim 1. Amended claims 7 and 13 are therefore also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 102(b) rejection of amended claims 7 and 13, and of claims 8 and 10-12 and claims 14 and 16-18, which depend from claim 7 or 13.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 3, 2008

By:   
Wenye Tan  
Reg. No. 55,662